

Remarks

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are presented for reconsideration, with claims 10, 18, and 21 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, Applicants seek to amend claims 10, 18, and 21. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing Amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 10-27 and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra (5,757,920) in view of Sitaraman (6,212,561). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, M.P.E.P. Section 2142.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teachings of Misra and Sitaraman fail to teach or suggest the claims. In particular, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest "wherein the user is disconnected from the first one of the first

and the second server machines before being connected to the second one of the first and the second server machines," as recited in claims 10, 18, and 21.

The Examiner states that Misra fails to teach "wherein the user is disconnected from the first one of the first and the second server machines before being connected to the second one of the first and the second server machines." To cure this deficiency the Examiner relies on Sitaraman (Sitaraman at Col. 6, lines 18-21, and Col. 7, lines 8-23) on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statements.

Assuming *arguendo* that it is proper to combine these references in the manner suggested, which Applicants do not admit, Sitaraman seems to only teach preventing access to a first server machine, while a connection with another domain/network, **not in the system**, is open. Columns 2-3 of Sitaraman clearly state that the problem Sitaraman addresses is an unauthorized entity on a public network (Internet) or a private network (of another company) accessing data through the tunnel connecting this other network with a first server machine. Thus, Sitaraman only teaches a first machine in a system connecting to a second machines outside of that system.

Furthermore, embodiments of the claims have the ability to **cause** the disconnection recited in claims 10, 18, and 21 precisely because the first and second server machines are both **in** the system: "wherein the user is disconnected from the first one of the first and the second server machines." By contrast, Sitaraman cannot disconnect the user, but only prevents access to a first server machine until the user is no longer connected to another domain/network. Therefore, because Sitaraman fails to

teach or suggest the above noted features of Claims 10, 18, and 21, Sitaraman cannot be used to cure the deficiencies of Misra. Thus, the applied references cannot be used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 10, 18, and 21.

Also, at least based on their respective dependencies to claims 10, 18, and 21, and further in view of their own respective features, claims 11-17, 19-20, 22-27, and 29-35 should be found allowable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-27 and 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.


Jason D. Eisenberg
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 10/1/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

846494_1.DOC